There is an outstanding issue, Your Honor, of what their plan is going to entail and whether or not they are going to seek to sell all of their assets and what the value of those assets are, and whether the value of those assets exceeds how much they owe to their creditors.

I think we are still waiting for some of that information that Mr. Keller says is something that will be ongoing and part of the reorganization plan, too, at the end of this month to the Bankruptcy Court.

So I think that issue is still outstanding as to whether or not they are seeking to put everything at the Second Thursday that may exceed how much they owe their creditors. That was the issue that we talked about the last time.

So in terms of whether this is something that is right for Second Thursday, I think there is still some information we need from Mr. Keller.

1 MR. KELLER: I just wanted to say, when I heard you restate it, I think I might 2 have misled you. It is not that, when we have 3 4 this hearing on the 2nd that everything will be all wrapped up. This hearing on the 2nd 5 will take care of the rest of the remaining --6 7 with a few minor exceptions, of the contracts for sale. 8 9 There is still the reorganization plan to be gone through with the court as to 10 how -- That just simply says the bankrupt 11 12 estate can sell these assets. That doesn't 13 get them out of bankruptcy yet or decide how 14 the company is going to be reorganized under 15 the plan. She is right. The reorganization 16 17 plan will have that, and I am prepared to 18 address some of those issues today. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, before we get 19 20 into that, I don't know how deep we want to get into that, but I am going to ask you to 21

give me an overview on that. But my question

then is this: Is the Bureau's position that the final approval of the plan by the Bankruptcy Court is necessary before the issue is ripe to -- and also, of course, the appropriate motions filed with respect to Second Thursday, but basically, the reorganization has to be approved by the Bankruptcy Court before there is even a Second Thursday issue for the WP to consider. that basically your position? MS. KANE: I believe that is the appropriate process, Your Honor, but it also would lend some ability for the Bureau to determine whether or not Second Thursday is even applicable. So we would suggest that we

would need to see the reorganization plan. Whether or not it has yet been approved by the court, it may not be as much of an issue, but obviously, if it were approved, that would be more helpful to us.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Why would you even be interested in it until the court approves

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	or disapproves it?
2	MS. KANE: I think we would like
3	to be able to know what it is Maritime is
4	intending to do in terms of some sort of
5	reorganization or a dissolution of its assets,
6	how it is intending to dissolve its estate.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: That will be
8	basically making available for the Bureau
9	responding with the Bankruptcy Court.
10	Correct?
11	MS. KANE: Correct, Your Honor,
12	and that was supposed to be filed next
13	Tuesday, and we are either next Tuesday or
14	next Monday. But we are concerned about
15	whether that timing is going to stick.
16	MR. KELLER: Let me first say, I
17	want to take a rare opportunity here, because
18	I don't often have this opportunity, but I
19	want to agree with Ms. Kane that the filing
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Pop the champagne.
21	MR. KELLER: The filing, but not
22	necessarily approval by the court of the

reorganization plan, is critical to putting together and presenting the Second Thursday plan. In fact, that is the one thing that is -- You know, I am not willing to present a detailed Second Thursday plan until we have the reorganization plan that includes how we are going to resolve this issue on file.

We are committing to get that Second Thursday petition filed as soon as possible after the reorganization plan is filed, not heard by the court but filed with the Bankruptcy Court, and I would say probably within 10 days to two weeks at the most following the filing of that reorganization plan with the Bankruptcy Court, we will be presenting the Second Thursday petition. That is number one.

Two other things I want to address is the timing of the reorganization plan and, secondly, the overview of what we believe right now the proposal is going to be, and what I am sure will be, as far as I am going

to get.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I am not going to go into some details. So there are some minor details that may change, but the overview will be the same. So let me first address that.

What is being proposed is: There is an entity being formed -- it may have already been formed -- by the secured creditors. The secured creditors in this case have formed an entity. That entity is going to do -- and I am not a bankruptcy lawyer -- what is called a credit bid.

They are going to acquire all of the licensed assets of Maritime, so all of the licensed assets of Maritime, subject to any pending contractual obligations. So that means if, for example, the Metrolink -- Say, if they would still be obligated to go through with that transaction, etcetera -- they will be doing this in exchange for their claims on In other words, rather than the estate. they will basically paying cash, be

liquidating their claims and taking the licensed assets into this entity.

entity will no longer hold any licensed assets. The only monies that may go to Maritime, and I am not even sure that they would go directly to Maritime or be pursued in some other arrangement, would be such funds as are necessary to pay the unsecured creditors and administrative claims, things like that.

So there would be no cash proceeds left in Maritime after this is done. I would also add that, in terms of claims on the estate that would be satisfied in this, these do not include -- would not include the claims of Sandra DePriest, Donald DePriest or Scotland House. In fact, when I prepared my status report, I was working from the schedules that have been filed with the court. There is now an actual claims register, and I would note that those claims aren't even on the register.

So that is essentially what the

plan is. The plan is to assign all the license assets out of Maritime into this entity owned by the secured creditors, and then the only proceeds that would affect Maritime at all would be to pay its unsecured creditors and administrative claims.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Does the Commission have to approve that?

MR. KELLER: Yes. Yes, but for that part we will need Bankruptcy Court approval. You know, we will need Bankruptcy Court approval for that transaction, and then we would come to the Commission; but what I anticipate that that would look like is, first would certainly of all, there be application for the Commission to assign the licenses from the DIP, the debtor possession, to this entity.

There may or may not be some twostep stages involved then to get the other pending contracts taken care of, or whether they could be handled laterally, I don't know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	But those are minor. But, yes, the Commission
2	would ultimately have to approve this, but
3	that would be part of the Second Thursday
4	plan, would be presenting the overall picture
5	saying, here is the plan, here is how we are
6	moving forward; we want you, pursuant to
7	Second Thursday, to approve this, including
8	consenting to the applications that are
9	necessary to implement this.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: How does that sound
11	to you, Ms. Kane?
12	MS. KANE: It raises a few
13	questions for us, Your Honor. First and
14	foremost, if there has been an evaluation of
15	the license inspector and beyond those covered
16	by the assumed contracts in other words,
17	what is the value of assets that is being
18	transferred to this secured creditor group.
19	That is number one.
20	Number two, who are the secured
21	creditor group, and what is the value of the
22	claim for the secured creditors? Mr. Keller

1	has identified the secured claims as only \$18
2	million. I think, as we have talked before,
3	the value of this license in this spectrum has
4	been valued by them to the Bankruptcy Court at
5	\$45 million.
6	If these creditors are assuming a
7	value of spectrum that is far beyond what they
8	are owed, that may cause an issue under Second
9	Thursday, Your Honor.
10	MR. HAVENS: This is Warren
11	Havens. May I just state that in the upcoming
12	I'm sorry.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Keller, I am
14	thrown off track here a little bit now. The
15	way you were saying it, I kind of thought it
16	was a wash, but it really is there is going
17	to be a difference Obviously, from what Ms.
18	Kane has said, there is going to be a sort of
19	a leftover slush fund or however you want to
20	characterize it.
21	MR. KELLER: No, there won't be
22	any leftover slush fund, because, as I said,

the only cash that will come out of this would 1 be, pursuant to this deal, they are canceling 2 They are also putting up the their debts. 3 cash necessary to pay the unsecured creditors 4 and administrative claims. 5 There is no extra cash going to be 6 left in Maritime as a result of this. 7 What 8 Ms. Kane is referring to --JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, in terms of 9 Maritime, but there is money -- There is a 10 value to all those licenses --11 12 MR. KELLER: Right. JUDGE SIPPEL: -- that are going 13 to be assigned to this Secured Creditors, Inc. 14 or whatever it is called, and that value is 15 going to exceed -- correct me if I am not 16 17 saying this right. It is going to exceed the amount of indebtedness of -- Yes, it is going 18 to exceed the amount of indebtedness of 19 20 Maritime. So that is going to be -- and then

If that's the case, what

what happens?

happens to that value?

21

1	MR. KELLER: First of all, I take
2	issue with the fact that that is the case.
3	That is a speculation. Mr. Rupke's license is
4	revoked. Under these circumstances and all
5	that, there is no way they are worth \$45
6	million, but whatever they are worth, I
7	MR. HAVENS: I would like to make
8	a relevant point, please.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now you can't
10	interrupt. We will get to you, Mr. Havens,
11	but not right now. Let him finish. Let him
12	finish.
13	MR. KELLER: So I would say the
14	question of the precise value of the assets is
15	a question of fact, and I don't think it has
16	been established. So we just can't throw
17	around a number like \$45 million and assume,
18	ha, ha, that's it.
19	Secondly, I would argue that
20	and this is a matter that will be fallout in
21	pleadings before the Commission and addressing
22	Second Thursday, I am sure, but I would argue

that the value -- the excess value, if any, is not relevant so long as who is taking that excess value is not the alleged wrongdoers.

The idea is -- Let's assume, for the sake of argument, that this secured creditors' committee would now have license assets that -- The amount of claims that they cancel plus the amount of cash that they put up to satisfy unsecured creditors' claims and administrative expenses: Let's assume that, when you add those together, there is still some added alleged value to the licenses.

Even so, that value is not going to the alleged wrongdoers. It is going to the secured creditors, number one. Number two, remember, the whole point of Second Thursday is to satisfy the claims of creditors and support the bankruptcy laws.

The alternative is that no creditor gets anything. You know, the alternative is we come back here. We have a license, and we risk the possibility that all

the licenses get revoked, and then no creditor gets anything. But as I say, the question of whether or not there is an excess value and whether or not that is legally relevant under Second Thursday is a question to be briefed and argued in the context of the Second Thursday petition, in my opinion.

JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. I am trying to get a feel for how much work has to be done before this case can move along, and it seems to me, there is a lot of work that has got to be done.

MS. KANE: Your Honor, we would argue that the question of fact as to the value of the licenses is a question for this forum, because it will determine whether or not Second Thursday is even an appropriate measure to move forward and, therefore, whether this hearing should be stayed with regard to Mr. Keller's and Maritime's motion to set.

If Second Thursday is not an

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	option, this hearing should proceed on all
2	issues.
3	MR. HAVENS: Your Honor, could I
4	make one point?
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: I am on a rather
6	significant issue here, Mr. Havens. I don't
7	mean to cut you off. We will get back to you.
8	MR. HAVENS: But it is on exactly
9	the point of value. There is experts who are
10	testifying to that and
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: I don't want to get
12	into the facts of the value. I am just
13	looking for issues right now, and there is an
14	item outstanding from the Bureau that Mr.
15	Keller has to address. So just stay quiet a
16	while. Go ahead, Mr. Keller.
17	MR. KELLER: I again dispute the
18	issue that the value of the licenses in this
19	context, under the scenario that I have laid
20	out, is relevant to Second Thursday. I mean,
21	the fact that there is some excess value it
22	doesn't really matter.

It would matter if the licenses 1 were being sold for cash and that cash was 2 going to stay in Maritime and then possibly, 3 therefore, go to the alleged wrongdoers, but 4 that is not the scenario that has been laid 5 6 out. The scenario that is laid out is 7 8 that no cash will go to Maritime or, if it 9 does, it is solely cash to pay unsecured creditors and administrative claims. 10 11 will be no excess cash money or any value --12 Proceeds of the license assets will not remain 13 with Maritime, period. Now the fact that those license 14 15 assets, are the license assets potentially 16 worth more than the -- A little. I presume 17 there is a business judgment here that the 18 secured creditors have to make, and maybe that 19 is a risk that they take in exchange for 20 canceling their debts. JUDGE SIPPEL: Counsel for 21 Pinnacle?

1 MR. CATALANO: For DEMCO, Your 2 Honor. JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm sorry. 3 MR. CATALANO: We participated in 4 5 the bankruptcy proceeding on the assumption of the DEMCO contract, and in the context of the 6 7 DEMCO contract, the court addressed valuation 8 for not only DEMCO but for all the contracts that were assumed. 9 The court found fair value, good 10 11 faith transactions. In the court's opinion 12 from the bench, the court expressed skepticism 13 regarding the prior valuation of the 14 million. In the bankruptcy proceeding as it 15 goes forward, the court will be addressing the 16 valuation issue, and any Second Thursday 17 showing would have the benefit of what is decided on the valuation issue 18 in the 19 bankruptcy proceeding, and that is an issue 20 that is directly in front of the bankruptcy proceeding, the valuation of those assets. 21

So the Commission would have the

benefit of the court's finding in that proceeding, but should not independently take off on a separate track to address valuation.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Are you saying or is it implied from what you are saying that it is going to be -- it is, in effect, res judicata that the Commission has no business getting into that?

MR. CATALANO: That issue of valuation has not been designated in this proceeding, and the issue of valuation is the very issue that the bankruptcy court determines in making its decisions on the liquidation of the estate.

That is within the jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court, and that is what the bankruptcy court is already in the process of doing, has done so on the contracts that it has addressed, will do so on the additional contracts on February 2nd and, finally, in addressing the bankruptcy plan of reorganization, will be addressing the final

valuation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

At that point, that record can go to the Commission under a Second Thursday showing, and the Commission will have the benefit of the findings of the court, the bankruptcy court, which is empowered to address those very issues. That is the purpose of the bankruptcy court.

I understand --JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you are giving me a good explanation, and it is very appropriate. But I am of the -- Well, I am not going to say where I am coming out on this, but I think that the Bureau and Ms. Kane is of the view that, once -- and I am not trying to put words in your But once all that is done -mouth, please. that is, the valuation is done and the bankruptcy court basically has a final ruling on what they find the value to be these issues are all -- at least, they have resolved them to the court's satisfaction, then it comes to the Commission.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

I think that the Bureau would have it come to me so that they could make their comment, objections or what-not accuracy of some of those figures. not satisfied, because it is the good faith --The issue with me would be does this qualify? In other words, does this qualify for Second Thursday in the generic, not necessarily in a point by point, but if there is reason to believe that the Second Thursday is being used as a device to get the case out of here, to get a case away from me -- I don't want to even suggest accusations, but if there is a significant difference between what the Bureau finds to be the true value and the value determined by the bankruptcy court because they can -- The bankruptcy court is going to consider whatever it is going to consider.

Let me rephrase it this way. It's the question of the good faith application of the principle of the Second Thursday doctrine.

If I am satisfied that this is all done in

1	good faith, then bang, it goes up to WB.
2	Now is my understanding correct?
3	MS. KANE: That would be our
4	concern, Your Honor. I think you phrased it
5	very accurately, which is that, depending on
6	how that valuation falls out, Second Thursday
7	is only designed to transfer licenses in an
8	effort to satisfy the creditors.
9	If they are getting more value
10	than what they are owed, then Second Thursday
11	may not apply and may not provide any basis to
12	hold up this hearing on the remaining issues.
13	So our concern, obviously, is to
14	get that information as quickly as possible.
15	We thought we were expecting a reorganization
16	plan with this detail outlined next week, but
17	now I still haven't heard from Mr. Keller when
18	that is going to be filed.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Can you give us
20	I'm sorry, yes, sir? Could I have your name?
21	MR. CATALANO: Al Catalano,
22	counsel for DEMCO.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Catalano.
2	MR. CATALANO: The only point I
3	would make on the valuation issue is the
4	Commission has, and the Bureau has, the
5	opportunity to participate in the bankruptcy
6	on the valuation issue, and that is the very
7	issue that is before the court in that
8	proceeding.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: I've never heard of
LO	that. The Commission Has the commission
L1	ever participated in a bankruptcy proceeding?
L2	MR. CATALANO: They have a right
L3	as a party to enter, Your Honor.
L4	JUDGE SIPPEL: As a party?
L5	MR. CATALANO: Or through the
L6	Justice Department. They certainly have an
L7	opportunity to address the valuation issue in
L 8	that proceeding.
L 9	JUDGE SIPPEL: It sounds like the
20	President is going to have all the attorneys
21	in the government running around looking for
22	fraud. I just think that is carrying it a

1	little further than it is intended to go, but
2	I don't really have the answer for you either.
3	But I think I understand I understand where
4	the Bureau is coming from, and I am inclined
5	to be of the same mind, that I want to see
6	I want the Bureau to have the opportunity to
7	examine this plan that the court is going to
8	approve or has approved before I send it out
9	of here up to WB, and I tell WB it looks like
10	is this qualified for Second Thursday? You
11	know, you make the determination, and you are
12	sort of nodding. I don't know if you are
13	approving that, but you understand that.
14	MR. CATALANO: I understand your
15	point, Your Honor.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: I am not trying to
17	be an intermediary. I am not trying to slow
18	the process down, but on the other hand
19	Well, on the other hand, I have said as much
20	as I can possibly say on this right now.
21	So having said all that, Mr.
22	Miller?

1	MR. KELLER: Keller.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Keller, I'm sorry.
3	MR. KELLER: I think Mr. Miller is
4	on the phone.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Miller, I can't
6	keep you out of my mind.
7	MR. MILLER: I appreciate that,
8	Your Honor.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: And I haven't
10	forgotten you either, Mr. Havens. Can you
11	give us a date or approximate date or a week?
12	MR. KELLER: Before that, let me
13	just say one thing.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: On the
14 15	JUDGE SIPPEL: On the reorganization.
Section .	
15	reorganization.
15 16	reorganization. MR. KELLER: That was one of the
15 16 17	reorganization. MR. KELLER: That was one of the two things I was going to address.
15 16 17 18	reorganization. MR. KELLER: That was one of the two things I was going to address. JUDGE SIPPEL: Right.
15 16 17 18	reorganization. MR. KELLER: That was one of the two things I was going to address. JUDGE SIPPEL: Right. MR. KELLER: You have said a

1	Because it is a Commission level designation
2	order, I am not sure that the Wireless Bureau
3	has delegated authority to address it, but
4	that is a minor point. Whatever it is, it is.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: I want to send it
6	to the right address.
7	MR. KELLER: I think it is to the
8	Commission unless the Commission acts to
9	somehow delegate authority to the Wireless
10	Bureau to act in this particular matter.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, we will get
12	to that.
13	MR. KELLER: So we will get to
14	that.
15	Until yesterday Until yesterday
16	at about 7:30 p.m., I fully anticipated coming
17	in here and saying that the reorganization
18	plan is going to be filed on Monday and that
19	we would be filing our Second Thursday showing
20	within a week to two weeks after that.
21	I got word from Bankruptcy counsel
22	last evening that he had just received a

letter from the unsecured creditors committee and that he was momentarily expecting a similar letter from the secured creditors group urging him to seek an extension of time to file the reorganization plan.

The contours that I laid out of this plan whereby the secured creditors are going to take the assets, etcetera -- apparently, everybody is on board with that between these various creditors. There are some issues, as I understand, on the fine points of it.

I think it largely has to do with whose claims have what priority in terms of how the money gets distributed, etcetera, because again the secured creditors are also putting up some cash to take care of the claims and the expenses.

So they urged him to seek an extension of 30 days to file the report. He said he feels like he has to honor that request, but we anticipate -- that group would